

Amendments to the Drawings:

The attached replacement drawing sheets make changes to Fig. 2 and replaces the original sheet with Fig. 2.

Attachment: Replacement Sheet

REMARKS

Claims 1-4, 6, 8-12 and 14 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1, 6, 11 and 14 are amended. Support for the amendments to claims 1 and 11 can be found at least in Figs. 2-4 and at paragraphs [0095]-[0103] and [0148] of the specification (as published). Claims 6 and 14 are amended for clarity. Thus, no new matter is added. Reconsideration based on the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

I. April 14, 2010 Telephone Interview

Applicants appreciate the courtesies shown to Applicants' representatives by Examiner Weaver in the April 14, 2010 telephone interview. Applicants' separate record of the substance of the interview is incorporated into the following remarks.

II. Information Disclosure Statement

An Information Disclosure Statement (IDS) has been filled simultaneously with this Amendment. The form PTO-1449 lists an International Search Report and six references cited therein which are currently of record (filed March 22, 2005). The receipt of such being acknowledge by the Notice of Acceptance of Application under 35 U.S.C. 371 and 37 C.F.R. 1.495 mailed June 6, 2005. For the Examiner's convenience, Applicants have also submitted English translations of the referenced cited therein. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner acknowledge the references and International Search Report by initialing the PTO-1449 and returning such to Applicants.

III. Improper Election of Claims 1-10 and 11-15

The Office Action indicates that claims 3, 7-10 and 15 have been withdrawn from further consideration. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the Election of Species Requirement mailed February 18, 2009.

PCT Rule 13 requires that claims which encompass one single general inventive concept be searched and examined in the same international application. For example, PCT Rule 13.1 states: "the international application shall relate to one invention or to a group of inventions so linked as to form a single general inventive concept."

Furthermore, PCT Rule 13.4 expressly states that: "subject to Rule 13.1, it shall be permitted to include in the same international application a reasonable number of dependent claims claiming specific forms of the invention claimed in an independent claim, even where the features of any dependent claim could be considered as constituting in themselves an invention."

As discussed below, claim 1, from which claims 3 and 8-10 depend, includes at least the novel features (1) connecting lines formed by connecting substantially linearly right and left ends of a pinch-off line with the inner ends of respective right and left mold parting lines, the connecting lines being substantially perpendicular to the mold parting lines, and (2) front and rear mold halves that include a semi-columnar bottom block, the semi-columnar bottom block being disposed inside each of said respective front and rear mold halves and having a top surface, the top surface forming a bottom disposed in a lower portion of a cylindrical body, the bottom and the cylindrical body forming a semi-circular bottom edge line.

Therefore, because claims 3 and 8-10 all depend from independent claim 1, claims 1, 3 and 8-10 must all include the same general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13. Thus, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the Election of Species Requirement and to examine all of the claims in this application.

IV. Objection to the Drawings

The Office Action objects to the drawings for allegedly not showing each and every element present in the claims. In particular, the Office Action alleges that "a diameter," as claimed, is not presently shown in the drawings. By this Amendment, the drawings have

been amended responsive to the objection. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the objection.

V. Objection to the Specification

The Office Action objects to the specification for allegedly containing claim number references to previously canceled claims. By this Amendment, a substitute specification has been submitted that is responsive to the objection. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the objection.

VI. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112

The Office Action rejects claims 1, 2, 4, 11 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as allegedly failing to comply with the written description requirement. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Specifically, Applicants assert that every circle inherently has a diameter. Therefore, as shown in the amended Fig. 2, the pinch off line 14 extends across the diameter 20 of the circular bottom edge line 18. Further, by this Amendment, Fig. 2 has been amended to point out the diameter 20. Accordingly, Applications respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

The Office Action also rejects claims 1, 2, 4, 6, 11, 12 and 14 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite. By this Amendment, claims 1, 6, 11 and 14 have been amended responsive to the rejection. Accordingly, Applications respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

VII. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103

The Office Action rejects claims 1, 2, 4, 6, 11, 12 and 14 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Düring (U.S. Patent No. 5,316,184) in view of Sheptak (U.S. Patent No. 3,399,424). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Specifically, as acknowledge by Examiner Weaver during the April 14, 2010 telephone interview, neither Düring nor Sheptak, alone or in combination, disclose or suggest

a blow-molded container having (1) connecting lines formed by connecting substantially linearly right and left ends of a pinch-off line with the inner ends of respective right and left mold parting lines, the connecting lines being substantially perpendicular to the mold parting lines, and (2) front and rear mold halves that include a semi-columnar bottom block, the semi-columnar bottom block being disposed inside each of said respective front and rear mold halves and having a top surface, the top surface forming a bottom disposed in a lower portion of a cylindrical body, the bottom and the cylindrical body forming a semi-circular bottom edge line, as recited in independent claim 1 and similarly recited in independent claim 11.

To the contrary, Düring discloses disclose a Z-shaped surface 23 (which comprises portions 23a, 23b and 23c) and flat separating surfaces 25a and 25b. The Office Action alleges that the Z-shaped surface 23 corresponds to the claimed pinch off line, connecting lines and mold parting line.

However, Düring's portions 23a and 23b of the Z-shaped surface 23 join the flat separating surfaces 25a and 25b so as to form an angle that is approximately 135° (*see* Fig. 6). In particular, Düring discloses that portion 23c forms an angle of between 20° - 45° with respect to a base support surface 28 (*see* col. 3, lines 53 and 54). Further, Düring's flat separating surfaces 25a and 25b are parallel with respect to the base support surface 28 (*see* col. 4, line 57). Therefore, as allegedly shown in Fig. 6, if Düring's portion 23c forms an angle of 45° with respect to the base support surface 28, portions 23a and 23b will form an angle that is approximately 135° with respect to the flat separating surfaces 25a and 25b.

Therefore, Düring fails to disclose connecting lines formed by connecting substantially linearly right and left ends of a pinch-off line with the inner ends of respective right and left mold parting lines, the connecting lines being substantially perpendicular to the

mold parting lines, as recited in independent claim 1 and similarly recited in independent claim 11.

Further, Düring discloses blow mold portions 10 and 14. The mold portions 10 and 14, as a single unit, form Düring's one-half of a blow mold form. As shown in Fig. 2, when formed as a single unit, the bottom of Düring's mold portions 10 contacts the top of the mold portion 14. In other words, Düring's mold portion 14 is not disposed within Düring's mold portion 10. Therefore, even assuming Düring's shape to be circular, Düring's mold portions 10 and 14 do not disclose front and rear mold halves that include a semi-columnar bottom block, the semi-columnar bottom block being disposed inside each of said respective front and rear mold halves and having a top surface, the top surface forming a bottom disposed in a lower portion of a cylindrical body, the bottom and the cylindrical body forming a semi-circular bottom edge line, as recited in independent claim 1 and similarly recited in independent claim 11.

Additionally, as shown in Figs. 1, 4 and 5, Düring's bottom 18 is V-shaped. As a result, Düring's seam 9' (formed by Düring's Z-shaped surface 23), extends in a V-shaped pattern across the bottom 18 (*see also* col. 3, lines 23-32). Further, even assuming Düring's shape to be circular, Düring's bottom 18 would still include a V-shape because Düring's bottle is designed to collapse and fold along fold line 15. Therefore, Düring's seam 9' does not linearly extend across a diameter and pass the center of the underside surface of the bottom, as recited in independent claim 1 and similarly recited in independent claim 11.

For at least the reasons discussed above, Düring fails to disclose each and every feature of independent claims 1 and 11. Sheptak fails to cure the above deficiencies of Düring. Therefore, independent claims 1 and 11 remain patentable over the combination of Düring and Sheptak. Claims 2, 4 and 6 are patentable at least for their dependencies from independent claim 1, as well as for the additional features they recite. Claims 12 and 14 are

patentable at least for their dependencies from independent claim 11, as well as for the additional features they recite.

VIII. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Linda M. Saltiel
Registration No. 51,122

JAO:JQB/ccs

Attachments:

Petition for Extension of Time
Replacement Sheet (Fig. 2)
Substitute Specification
Clean Copy of Substitute Specification

Date: April 14, 2010

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 320850
Alexandria, Virginia 22320-4850
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

**DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE
AUTHORIZATION**

Please grant any extension
necessary for entry of this filing;
Charge any fee due to our
Deposit Account No. 15-0461